

**REMARKS**

At the outset, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Non-Final Office Action of February 3, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 11, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hirakata (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,172); rejected claims 6 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirakata in view of Morita (U.S. Patent No. 6,628,274); rejected claims 10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirakata in view of Jeong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,271,816); and objected to claims 7-9 and 18-20 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The rejections of the claims are traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 7-9 and 18-20. Applicant also appreciates the Examiner's authorization granted to correct the minor informalities in the Drawings; the entry of claims 10-20; and the acknowledgment that the Applicant's remarks made in the Reply filed November 17, 2003, overcome the Examiner's previous objection to the specification.

The rejection of claims 1-5, 11, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hirakata, is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over Hirakata in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "allowing the adjacent pixels in a gate line direction within the pixel block to respond to data signals having the same polarity; and allowing the

pixels within the other pixel areas except for the pixel block to respond to data signals having a polarity contrary to the adjacent pixels at the left and right sides thereof.” Hirakata fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, at least this feature of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-4, which depend from claim 1, are also allowable over Hirakata.

Independent claim 5 is allowable over Hirakata in that claim 5 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “first signal supplying means for setting at least one pixel block each of which includes at least two data lines within the liquid crystal panel to apply data signals having the same polarity to the adjacent pixels in a gate line direction within the pixel block; and second signal supplying means for applying data signals having a polarity contrary to the adjacent pixels at the left and right sides thereof to the pixels within the other pixel areas except for the pixel block area.” Hirakata fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, at least this feature of claim 5.

Independent claim 11 is allowable over Hirakata in that claim 11 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “applying video signals to at least one first plurality of consecutively arranged data lines such that video signals having the same polarity are applied to pixels adjacent each other along a gate line direction; and applying video signals to at least one second plurality of consecutively arranged data lines, different from the at least one first plurality of consecutively arranged data lines such that video signals having opposite polarities are applied to pixels adjacent each other along a gate line direction.” Hirakata fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, at least this feature of claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15, which depends from claim 11, is also allowable over Hirakata.

Independent claim 16 is allowable over Hirakata in that claim 16 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “first signal supplying means for applying video signals to at least one first plurality of consecutively arranged data lines such that video signals having the same polarity are applied to pixels adjacent each other along a gate line direction; and second signal supplying means for applying video signals to at least one second plurality of consecutively arranged data lines, different from the at least one first plurality of consecutively arranged data lines such that video signals having opposite polarities are applied to pixels adjacent each other along a gate line direction.” Hirakata fails to teach, either expressly or inherently, at least this feature of claim 16.

In rejecting claims 1, 5, 11, and 16, the Examiner cites Hirakata as teaching an apparatus and method for driving a liquid crystal panel comprising “first signal supplying means for setting at least one pixel block each of which includes at least two data lines... to apply data signals having the same polarity to the adjacent pixels in a gate line direction within the pixel block; and second signal supplying means for applying data signals having a polarity contrary to adjacent pixels at the left and right sides thereof to the pixels within the other pixel areas except for the pixel block area (col. 8, lines 36-54 and Figs. 17A and 17B).” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

At column 8, lines 36-54, Hirakata teaches,

“Then the present inventors carried out experiments by use of simple display pixels, and carried out the source line inversion driving, as shown in FIG. 17A, by inverting polarities of signal potentials for every plural columns (two lines) at the same time. As compared with the conventional source line (one column) inversion driving, the number of disclination stripes was halved, so that the entire of the display picture became bright. FIG. 20A is a microphotograph of a stripe pattern of disclination produced at this time for every two columns.

However, as shown in FIG. 17B, the produced disclination pattern has one kind, similarly to FIG. 16B. Thus, the disclination is continuously formed at a fixed position, and an interval between adjacent disclination stripes becomes larger (two columns in FIG. 17B), so that there occurs a problem that the stripe pattern of disclination is recognized by a human eye."

Assuming *arguendo* that Hirakata teaches "first signal supplying means for setting at least one pixel block each of which includes at least two data lines... to apply data signals having the same polarity to the adjacent pixels in a gate line direction within the pixel block," Applicant respectfully submits that Hirakata fails to teach or suggest "second signal supplying means for applying data signals having a polarity contrary to adjacent pixels at the left and right sides thereof to the pixels within the other pixel areas except for the pixel block area," as asserted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the present rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

The rejection of claims 6 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirakata in view of Morita, is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The present application was filed on September 1, 2000 and claims the benefit of foreign priority to September 4, 1999 in Korean Patent Application No. P99-37587. Morita, however, was filed on March 24, 2000. By this reply, Applicant hereby perfects the claim for foreign priority and submits a certified English translation of the foreign priority document Korean Patent Application No. P99-37587. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits Morita is not available as prior art for purposes of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the present rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Application No.: 09/654,943  
Reply dated August 2, 2004  
Reply to Office Action dated February 3, 2004

Docket No.: 8733.294.00

The rejection of claims 10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirakata in view of Jeong et al., is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 10 and 12-14 variously depend from independent claims 1 and 11 and, therefore, includes all of the features variously set forth in claims 1 and 11. As described above Hirakata fails to teach at least the aforementioned features set forth in claims 1 and 11. Even if Jeong et al. discloses the various features asserted by the Examiner, and even if Jeong et al. could be combined with Hirakata as suggested by the Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that Jeong et al. fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Hirakata with respect to claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 10 and 12-14 are allowable over Hirakata in view of Jeong et al. by virtue of their various dependence from claims 1 and 11 and requests withdrawal of the present rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

Application No.: 09/654,943

Docket No.: 8733.294.00

Reply dated August 2, 2004

Reply to Office Action dated February 3, 2004

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 2, 2004

By



Kurt M. Eaton  
Registration No: 51,640  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE, LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Telephone No.: (202) 496-7500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 496-7756

Application No.: 09/654,943

Docket No.: 8733.294.00

Reply dated August 2, 2004

Reply to Office Action dated February 3, 2004

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 2, 2004

By  \_\_\_\_\_

Kurt M. Eaton  
Registration No: 51,640  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE, LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Telephone No.: (202) 496-7500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 496-7756